

OCT 06 2006

## REMARKS

Applicants elect with traverse to prosecute the claims of Group I. With regards to the claims of Group I and of Group II, it is the Examiner's position that the claims of Group I and Group II are related as combination and subcombination. In accordance with MPEP §806.05(c), inventions in this relationship are distinct if (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination for patentability and 2) the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations. The Examiner indicates on page 3 of the Office Action that the claims of Group II have a separate utility from the claims of Group I. The Examiner cites as an example that the claims of Group II have separate utility "*as fabric treatment per se*". Applicants respectfully submit that the claims of Group I also have the same utility (i.e.; useful for fabric treatment). [See pages 1 – 6 of the instant specification]. Hence, as the claims of both Group I and Group II are both useful for fabric treatment, the requirements for restriction have not been met. As the restriction requirement between the claims of Group I and Group II is improper, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to remove this requirement.

Furthermore, as the search and examination of the entire application can be made without serious burden, Applicants respectfully request that the restriction requirement be removed in its entirety.

Respectfully submitted,  
FOR: RANCHERI ET AL.;

BY: 

Julia A. Glazer  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 41,783  
(513) 627-4132

October 6, 2006  
Cincinnati, Ohio